

DOI: 10.15826/vopr\_onom.2018.15.2.015  
UDC 811.162.3'373.211.5 + 81'373.42 + 81'282.2

**Jaroslav David**  
University of Ostrava  
Ostrava, Czech Republic

## **TOPONYMY IN A RELOCATED CITY: THE CITY OF MOST, CZECH REPUBLIC**

This article addresses the toponymy of the North Bohemian city of Most, Czech Republic, and its development during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The city of Most makes a unique case, as the old city, first documented in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, was demolished between 1964 and 1982 to pave the way for coal mining, and replaced by a new one of the same name built by 1987 to the south of the original city area. The article focuses on the urban toponymy of the newly built city of Most (a typical example of a Socialist modernist city), particularly on unofficial (popular) forms of urban names as compared to official street name forms, on the transfer of place names and chrematonyms from the old city to the new one, and on the role of place names in the preservation and creation of the local identity and collective memory. The author shows that the support for saving the old city memory on behalf of the state and local authorities has been a threefold initiative implemented through the conservation of the city name, the transfer of street names, and the use of chrematonyms (mostly names of pubs) specific to the old city. The analysis of urban place names is based on archival sources (predominantly maps), on a field survey, and on individual and group face-to-face interviews with inhabitants of the city performed in the course of 2014 and 2015.

**K e y w o r d s:** Czech language, city of Most, street names, unofficial urbanonymy, popular place names, transonymization, local identity, collective memory.

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was supported by the University of Ostrava's internal grant (SGS) project no. 1/FF/2014 *Toponyma — ohrožené kulturní dědictví* [Place Names: Cultural Heritage in Danger].

© David Jaroslav, 2018

## 1. Introduction

This article explores the toponymy of the North Bohemian city of Most (population 65,650 in 2017), focusing on the radical changes which occurred during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The specific nature of the city and its toponymic landscape is due to its modern history, characterized by dynamic industrial development, the slow decay of the old Most, its rapid demolition, relocation, and finally the construction of the new Most.

The central focus of the text is not only on standardized urbanonymy, street and square names, with a description of their evolution and inspiration; this merely provides a background for the main topic of the study. I focus on the toponymy of the newly built city, emphasizing the existence of non-standardized forms of place names, the act of transferring place names from the old city to the new one, and on the role of place names in preserving and creating a local identity and memory of place.

## 2. Current trends in research of urban names in Czech toponomastics

Systematic research into the toponymy of urban areas began in Czech (or previously Czechoslovak) onomastics in the 1980s and 1990s [David, 2012a, 227–230]. Political changes in the Soviet bloc, accompanied by the renaming of cities, and specifically streets and squares, played a crucial role in stimulating this field of study. At the time, Czech onomastic research concentrated predominantly on the description of developmental tendencies during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the analysis of standardized forms of street names in particular cities and the political intentions behind place name changes. Paradoxically, although one of the key features of the Czech onomastic research is to regard to the usage of toponymy as part of social communication [David, 2016b, 40–43], the topic of non-standardized forms of street names has not been dealt with.<sup>1</sup>

Three distinct layers can be detected in the urbanonymy of most Czech cities that share a similar history; in all cases, the origin of these layers lies in the historical development of the urban area. The first and perhaps the most obvious layer (drawing on directories of street names) is represented by standardized names. Predominantly, these street names were created in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, based on the original place names in the city centre (*intra muros*), via a process of standardization. This group of urban names was under a strong influence of commemoration in the modern time [cf. David, 2011a, 200–201; 2011b, 166–185]. The second group consists of those original non-urban (rural) names in the parts of the surrounding countryside that

---

<sup>1</sup> Exceptions are, however, the recent pioneering work on the urbanonymy of the Polish city of Poznań [Zagórski, 2008], and the current research on the Czech Socialist cities of Ostrava and Havířov [David & Mácha, 2014, 45–97], concrete housing estates in Ostrava and Prague [David & Místecký, 2016; Kojetínová, 2016], or Prague during the Communist era [Kojetínová, 2017].



Picture 1. The city of Most on an old map (1913, detail of a 3rd Military Survey map reproduced in [Šimůnek, 2014, map 18]) and a contemporary satellite image of the same place (GEODIS Brno, Google). The red outlines show Hněvín hill dominating the city with a medieval castle ruin on its top and the place of the recently built *Central Most* shopping centre in the new city — they can be used as reference points for comparing the two images.

gradually became absorbed into the growing city as the urban area expanded beyond the medieval city walls. These names were then either adopted into standardized street names or totally forgotten. The last group embraces non-standardized urbanonymy.

Non-standardized (popular) urban place names are closely tied to the everyday life of a particular city and its inhabitants. Because of this, they are known in Czech and Slovak toponomastics as *živá jména*, the ‘living names,’ i.e. names that are used in everyday communication [cf. David, 2012b; David & Mácha, 2014, 19; Krško, 2013, 154–156]. The main features that differentiate these “living names” from the standardized forms of urban place names are the following.

1. Even though “living names” are characterized as typical of unofficial communication, they also appear in official texts, e.g. notices, advertisements, newspapers, etc. — i.e. texts functioning in public and official communication. Mathew Pires uses the term *popular toponyms*, defining them as place names that “replace or accompany the official name, such popular place names are what might be called ‘universal popular toponyms,’ the name used by all, or practically all of the community. However, the categories of ‘popular’ and ‘official’ are in no way watertight. Popular terms may achieve official status” [Pires, 2007, 132; cf. David & Mácha, 2014, 19–23]. In this text, I use both terms *official name* and *standardized name* as synonyms, although there is a difference in the presence, or absence, of the standardization process in the name existence background; not every place name appearing in official documents or communication has to have a status of a standardized one. The standardization process implies that the form of a particular name, including ways of its public presentation, has been supervised and acknowledged by a municipal/local authority.

2. The non-standardized urban names appear in two specific forms (A and B types), from the viewpoint of their motivation, against the background of standardized urbanonymy. Several examples from the toponymy of Most will be used to illustrate their specificity later in the text.

Type A involves “living names” in the strict sense. These names are unique in their inspiration, language form and lexical base. They have no current relation to existing standardized street name forms, e.g. *U Tří sýrů* (‘At the Three Cheeses,’ a place named after three small triangular buildings that resemble pieces of cheese). This group also includes place names that have already lost the status of standardized forms, e.g. *Stalingradská* (‘Stalingrad District’), now an area stretching along SNP Street (SNP — the Slovak National Uprising street) in Most, a part within the district of Zahražany.

Type B consists of “living names” in a broader sense. Their forms are based on standardized street names, e.g. *Skupovka* instead of the standardized form *Skupova ulice* ‘Skupa Street,’ *Staliňák* instead of *Stalinovy závody* ‘Stalin Works,’ *Širák* instead of *Široký vrch* ‘Broad Hill.’ From the point of view of word-formation, there is a specific subtype within the type B. These names are based on standardized forms consisting of possessive forms of personal names plus word *ulice* ‘street.’ A suffix *-ka* is characteristic of them, e.g. *Skupova ulice* — *Skupovka*, *Žižkova ulice* — *Žižkovka*.



A suffix *-ák* is typical of non-standardized forms based on forms made from possessive forms of personal names plus the word *náměstí* ‘square,’ e.g. *Benešovo náměstí* ‘Beneš Square’ (the city of Teplice) — *Benešák*, *Karlovo náměstí* ‘Karel Square’ (the city of Prague) — *Karlák* [cf. Prošek, 2005].

3. The “living place names” do not have standardized forms at the moment of their creation, although, as mentioned above, they can acquire official status. For instance, they can become official street names, a part of a company name (pub, hotel, shop), or they can be adopted as official names in the public transport sphere, e.g. as the names of bus or tram stops.

4. As a result of the non-existence of any standardization process in the system of “living place names,” there may appear several different forms referring to a particular place, building, or object. These forms are typically similar variants, occurring mostly in spoken language, e.g. *U Tří sýrů*, *U Tří sejrů*, *U Třech sejrů*, *U Sejrů* ‘At the Three Cheeses’ or ‘At the Cheeses’; *Sedmistovky*, *Sedmikila*, *Sedmy* ‘Seven Hundreds’ / ‘Sevens’; *Neprakta*, *Neprakták*, *Nepraš* ‘Neprakta Club.’ Even though they refer to the same object, they cannot be regarded as absolute toponymic synonyms [Krško, 2013, 154, 160–162; Lábus, 2014, 49–52]. They may differ from each other in various ways, e.g. the level of awareness of the name and its usage in communication by different generations of the city’s inhabitants, a particular stylistic feature or quality of expressivity, etc. — e.g. *Hydrák*, *Staliňák*, *Chemička*, *Chemopetrol* — all names used for a large chemical plant in Záluží near Most, previously named *Sudetenländische Treibstoffwerke* — *STW*, known also as *Hydrierwerke*, later named *Stalinovy závody* ‘Stalin Works.’

5. The adjectival form *živý* ‘living’ describes those place names existing in close connection with people and their everyday lives.<sup>2</sup> The fact of their tight connection with everyday life — they are “lived through and experienced” by urban people — is also illustrated by the dynamism of their changes. During my first survey in 2014, the place name *U Naháče* ‘Next to the Naked Man’ was recorded among youngsters attending elementary schools in Most. The name referred to the place within the shopping centre *Central Most*, where a sculpture of a naked man was placed; this was a meeting point for elementary school pupils. However, next year the sculpture was removed and relocated to the top of the art school building. When the place name lost its original inspiration and connection with a particular object, it was forgotten. The replacement of the sculpture (out of the public space used every day) also caused this extraordinary artifact to lose its potential of an onymic object to inspire a new place name creation.

However, it is not only people’s memory in spoken and written forms (e.g. personal memoirs, diaries, etc.) that helps these names to survive and live on into the next generation. An important role is also played by written texts in public spaces (*scriptorial*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. [Blanár, 2009, 107] on personal living names: “The motivation of names is life, which is why we use the term *living names*.”

*landscape*) [Gade, 2003; cf. David & Mácha, 2014, 41], such as notices, neon signs, standardized forms of street names, names of pubs, shops and public transport stops, tourist trail signposts, etc. These texts perpetuate the place names, and through them, they perpetuate the history of the object or place, even though the latter may have already been altered or even demolished and erased from the map [cf. Halbwachs, 1992, 45].

### 3. History of the city of Most

The old city of Most, founded in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, was situated on the Bílina River, and it ranked among the most important historic cities in Bohemia. The Old Czech form *Hněvín Most* was first recorded in 1041 as *ad pontem Gnevin* ‘Hněva’s Bridge’; later, the city name appeared as *Brüx* (based on *Brücke*) in German, *Pons* in Latin, both meaning ‘bridge’ [cf. Profous, 1951, 135–136; Kuča, 2000, 161].

Although Most quickly became wealthy from trade and the surrounding vineyards, its development was not long-lived, as it was interrupted by the Thirty Years’ War in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century. After a period of decline, an entirely new stage in Most’s development began in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Rich deposits of brown coal (lignite) were discovered, which transformed the region at the foothills of the Krušné Hory Mountains (Erzgebirge in German) into an important industrial area on the border between Bohemia and Saxony. Before the Second World War, the presence of brown coal also attracted the petrochemical industry to the region. A large petrochemical complex known as *Hydrierwerke* (now *Chemopetrol*) producing artificial oil and gas from local coal was established in the nearby village of Záluží in May 1939. At that time, the city of Most was part of Sudetenland, a region with a majority German population that had already been annexed by Hitler’s Third Reich as a result of the Munich Agreement of September 1938.

According to the last pre-war population census in 1930, the population of Most was 28,212, but only a third of the inhabitants were Czechs (9,740 people) [Kuča, 2000, 164]. After the Second World War, the German population dramatically reduced. Between 1945 and 1947, the German inhabitants were expelled from the city — first in an uncoordinated way, and later via organized expulsions to Germany. The German population of Most fell to just one-thirtieth of its pre-war level, to 795 persons (343 persons in 2011), and by the end of the 1950s, the total city population was less than 21,000 [Kuča, 2000, 164; Glassheim, 2006, 68–73; 2007, 451–453; Hellmich et al., 2014, 36; Petržilka, 2014, 240, 274, 299].

The Hněvín Hill still remains the most prominent feature in a landscape that was utterly transformed during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There were two major causes of the changes. Firstly, the rich brown coal deposits had until that time been mined predominantly underground, but then there came a shift to open-cast mining, which is a type of mining that had a dramatic visual impact on the landscape. Secondly, the expulsion of the original German population, living in the region from the 13<sup>th</sup> century,

after the Second World War caused major demographic changes in the city's population. Empty houses became new homes for Roma inhabitants (called *Cikáni*, 'Gypsy people,' in that-time documents), originally from Slovakia, with a totally different lifestyle that accelerated the city's decay. Both these factors gave rise to a process described in official documents as *likvidace*, 'liquidation.' This was an administrative euphemism for the demolition of the old city, which was situated directly above 100 million tons of high-quality coal [Kuča, 2000, 197; Glassheim, 2007, 448, 453–465; Spurný, 2014; 2015; 2016, 69–86].

The vacated and then gradually resettled borderland region, including the old city of Most, became a strategically vital part of Czechoslovakia's postwar economy. In 1948, the Communist Party seized power, and the country became a part of the Soviet bloc. The socialist state's economic policy considered coal and steel production to be the only activities of real value and the only genuine criteria for economic and social development. Other economic activities were unfairly marginalized and presented as obstacles to a happy communist future, and so their importance was downplayed [cf. David & Davidová Glogarová, 2016; Spurný, 2016].

In terms of place names, this period is commonly characterized by the creation of a state landscape or a socialist landscape [David, 2011a, 218; 2011b, 54, 173; Hájek, 2008, 51–60]. Not only city names, but above all the names of streets and squares were changed. The state fundamentally altered the landscape, building new industrial complexes, factories, dams, and power stations. In the former Sudetenland, now cut off behind the Iron Curtain, the devastation of the abandoned villages and cities was all too apparent. During this period, dozens of settlements were erased from the map — and one of them was to be the old city of Most [cf. Zmizelé Sudety; <http://www.zanikleobce.cz>].

The city, with its rich history and numerous historical monuments, was left to its own devices. The dangerous and ever-expanding open-cast mine was gradually encroaching the Most. At the behest of the national government, building maintenance and repairs in the old city centre were stopped, and the only area with new buildings was relocated to the south, on the other side of the Bílina River and the railway line. This district below the Hněvín Hill was earmarked to become the beginning of the new city. The history of the old city was nearing its end.

On 26<sup>th</sup> March 1964, the Czechoslovak government issued Resolution № 180 *O dostavbě nového Mostu a likvidaci staré části města* (On the completion of new Most and the liquidation of the old part of the city) [Usnesení vlády ČSSR]. This marked the culmination of nearly a decade of discussions and calculations on the economic benefits of the proposal. The completion of the new Most and the liquidation of the old city meant demolishing not only apartment blocks, but also five churches, a monastery, a brewery, the city hall, a theatre, two railway stations, and much more. The fate of the city was sealed.

During the period from 1964 to 1982, the whole of the old city of Most was demolished except for several streets with pre-war buildings, a school (now the city museum)

situated behind the new transport corridor, one short street on the edge of the old centre, and the majestic Gothic church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. This was the only major monument they decided to save, even though this would take moving it for 841.1 meters to preserve it. It was not reconstructed until the 1990s. The communists regarded themselves as more powerful than God, and thus churches were expelled from the city or forbidden within the urban area of the new socialist city.<sup>3</sup> In the new city, the only sacred building constructed up to the end of 1989 was the small “cube” of a church named Saint Wenceslas, hidden among residential buildings.

#### 4. Toponymy in the relocated city of Most

In the following pages I will focus on two key topics: non-standardized toponymy in the new Most and the transfer of history and local memory from the old city to the new one through its place names.

The construction of the new city of Most encompassed two phases of development [cf. Kuča, 2000, 197–199]. The first one is represented by apartment blocks built from the 1950s to the mid-1960s during the mass transfer of people from the old Most to the new Most. The second phase is represented by the new districts of the city built from the mid-1970s to the end of the 1980s. This phase of building was not regarded as an extension to the original city; it was intended to create a new housing stock and to replace the demolished city as quickly and cheaply as possible. The district bounded by Skupova Street, Československé armády, and Budovatelů Avenues was built in the decorative style of the 1950s. The districts built at a later date represent an attempt to create a modernist socialist city [cf. Hellmich, 2014, 30–35; Šimůnek, 2014; Mapová sbírka Most]. However, because of the poor quality standards that were prevalent in the socialist building industry, this aim was not achieved, and the outcome was instead a typical socialist urban zone consisting mainly of prefabricated concrete buildings.

Between June 2014 and June 2015, I undertook qualitative research in the city of Most concentrating on knowledge of non-standardized toponymy, i.e. an individual's (active) toponymic repertory, and its usage in everyday communication. Before the research, I formulated the hypothesis according to which: 1) the urban inhabitants prefer non-standardized place names to standardized forms of street names; 2) there are considerable differences in the knowledge of non-standardized names arising from the age of the city people or their membership in a particular social group [cf. Krško, 2013, 155–158].

The research is based on 24 individual and group face-to-face interviews with inhabitants of the city (48 respondents) of ages ranging from 14 to 86 (the young generation: from 14 to 16, 28 persons; the middle generation: from 30 to 60, 10 persons;

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the similar circumstances in the socialist cities of Havířov and Ostrava-Poruba [David & Mácha, 2014, 90]; on the typology of socialist cities see [Matlovič, 2004, 139].



the elder generation: from 61 to 86, 10 persons). The selection of informants was made on the basis of two sociolinguistic variables, i.e. age and domicile in the city. Informants were asked not only to list the non-standardized place names they knew for particular urban places and objects, but also to use them in a dialogue on common everyday topics. For instance, they were asked to explain where a particular object is situated, or to characterize the name from the point of communicative usage, e.g. an answer such as “the name has been still used within my generation, but my grandsons do not know where the place is.” The collected data consists of 98 place names; they are available at the *Názvy míst* database [<http://www.nazvymist.cz>].

The place names were then categorized according to several criteria, the most important being the age of the respondents. Using the age criterion, the place names gathered in the research showed that some place names were associated with a specific location and age group. For instance, while the place names *Neprakták* ‘Neprakta Club,’ *Skupovka* ‘Skupa Street,’ *U Stovky* ‘At a Hundred,’ *Stovky*, *Dvojstovky*, *Sedmistovky*, etc. ‘Hundred,’ ‘Two Hundred,’ ‘Seven Hundred’ and *Staliňák* ‘Stalin Works’ are used by the inhabitants of Most regardless of their age, only senior citizens use place names such as *Hydrák* ‘Hydrierwerke’ (chemical plant), *Murom* (‘Murom Hotel,’ now *Cascade Hotel*), *Plecháč*, roughly meaning ‘Place of Sheet Metal,’ *U Rybárny* ‘At the Fishmonger’s’ and *Stalingradská* ‘Stalingrad District.’ In case of several place names, there is a semantic shift; for example, in the elder and middle generations the place name *Zimák* (*Zimní stadion*, ‘Ice Stadium’) is connected with the old ice stadium (now converted into a facility for different sports), while the new ice stadium is known as the *Stadion*. Nevertheless, the younger generation uses the place name *Zimák* for the new ice stadium.

Regardless of age and spatial criteria, the research revealed numerous clusters of place names with the status of *social (micro)toponyms* [cf. Krško 1998; 2013, 156]. While the term *toponymy* is used to denote place names as a whole, the term *social (micro)toponymy* refers to place names that are known and used only within a particular social group, e.g. by students in a particular school or classroom, people living in a house, family members, workers in a particular factory, etc. This fact is illustrated by the research carried out at three elementary schools in Most (Rozmarýnová, Václava Talicha, and Zdeňka Štěpánka). In everyday communication, the students at these schools use place names like *Akváč* ‘Aquadrom, water world,’ *Rozmáňo* ‘Divadlo rozmanitostí theatre,’ *U Bati* ‘At Batia’s,’ and *U Tří sýrů* ‘At the Three Cheeses,’ which are generally well-known. However, there are also place names connected only with social life in a specific school or class group. For instance, the following place names were recorded only in a particular school and nowhere else: *Hrádek* ‘Small Castle,’ *Stavba* ‘Building,’ *U Kašny* ‘At the Fountain’ (Rozmarýnová school), *Na Rovině* ‘Flat Plain,’ *Na Souši* ‘At the Football Field of the Village of Souš,’ *U Dýdý* ‘At Dýdý,’ *U Hanysky* ‘At Hanyska’ (Václava Talicha school). A different and specific type of place name usage is typical of the social group of coal miners, e.g. names of coal mines, such as *Centrumka* (officially *Centrum* ‘Centre’), *Čtyřka* (*Čtyři*, ‘Number Four’), *Koháč*

(*Kohinoor*) or *Ksindl* (*Alexander*, Czech word *ksindl* means ‘a bastard’). These names have the status of social toponyms.

At the beginning of the article, I discussed the complicated history of the city, which was deeply influenced by coal mining. Despite the demolition of the historical buildings, the memory of the vanished city remained embedded in the minds of its inhabitants. Even though they had lost their homes, they took their individual memories with them. A few “living names” from old Most still survive in the memories of its people, e.g. *Běla*, a colloquial form of the *Bílina* River, *Fímark*, from German *Viehmarkt* ‘Cattle market,’ *Na Komendě* ‘At the Commandery,’ *Střelnice* ‘Shooting range.’ These old names from the lost city surface not only in research interviews with the senior generation; they are also frequently used in novels and poetry as a means to evoke the atmosphere of the old city of Most and the memories of its literary characters [cf. Brycz, 1998; 2008; Páral, 1975]. However, the old city is remembered not only with a nostalgia typical of the elder generation, but also with the raw, realistic view more associated with the younger generation — i.e. a view of the city as dirty and smelly, gradually falling into decay.

However, the original city is remembered not only in the minds of its inhabitants [cf. Zagajewski, 2007, 17–18], but also in the newly created urban landscape. Place names thus play a crucial role in commemorating the old city.

The attempts to preserve the history and traditions of old Most were threefold. The first two cases represent and express the interests of the state and local authorities to save the old city memory.

1. Conservation of the city name. Although the new city was referred to as *Nový Most* ‘New Most’ to differentiate it from the old town, which was named *Starý Most* ‘Old Most,’ over the course of time, the name *Most* came into common use — until it was finally adopted, or more precisely “transferred” to the new city. This is a very important fact indicating an effort to preserve the city’s history and to create a connection between the old and new cities. It is illustrated by headlines from the Communist Party’s official newspaper *Rudé právo* in the 1960s, e.g. *Starý Most zmizí — dobudujeme Most nový*, *Starý Most ustupuje uhlí* “Old Most is Disappearing — We are Completing New Most, Old Most Makes Way for Coal” [cf. David & Davidová Glogarová, 2016].

In the 1950s, it was a normal practice in the Soviet bloc (above all in the USSR) to rename not only streets, but also entire cities. This practice receded in the 1960s and 1970s. The preservation of the name *Most* was helped not only by its long history, but also by its association with a major workers’ strike in 1932. Most became a communist place of memory, a symbol of the proletarian movement, and after its demolition and rebuilding, it was held up as an exemplar of the new communist era.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. a case of saving the city of Duchcov near Most because of the existence of the viaduct, a place of communist memory, see [Pýcha, 2014, 269–272; cf. Spurný, 2016, 162].

The historical city name *Most* appears not just on road signs within the new city. There are also large signs with the text *Most* situated on buildings, e.g., on the top of the high-rise building of the railway station which faces the new city, on the city hall, the stadium, and the new shopping centre called *Central Most*. These signs advertise the fact that this new city, made from sterile concrete blocks, is still the city of Most. Ironically, a new large artificial lake in the area of the old historical city is known as *Most*, sometimes as *Mostecké jezero* ‘Lake of Most’; its standardized name sounds *Jezero Most* ‘Lake Most’ [<http://www.geonames.org>].

The architecture of concrete and glass in the new city is very different from that of the old Most. Its modern urban plan is not based on a grid pattern of streets, but is laid out along a 3.5 kilometer-long avenue instead. Its name, *třída Budovatelů* ‘Avenue of the Construction Workers,’ referring to the former regime’s notion of the workers’ heroic role in “building” communism, is a somewhat ironic appellation, given the history of the old city and the fact that the new city is still permanently under construction. The status of the city is also reflected in the titles of books such as *Most: nedokončené město* ‘Most: An Unfinished City’ [Novák, 2012] and *Mé ztracené město* ‘My Lost City’ [Brycz, 2008]. The avenue, *třída Budovatelů*, creates a bridge (*most* in Czech) between the pre-existing or lost city and the new districts.

2. Transfer of street names. This way to preserve the *genius loci* of the old city was used by local authorities after 1989.<sup>5</sup> This trend is described in anthropological literature as the need for thematized memory to be expressed, “framed,” in a particular space [Halbwachs, 2009, 200–201]. Several street names of medieval origin were transferred to the linguistic landscape of the new city: *Barvířská* ‘Dyers’ Street,’ *Kabátnická* ‘Coat-makers’ Street,’ and the pre-war names *1. náměstí* and *2. náměstí* ‘First Square’ and ‘Second Square.’<sup>6</sup> It was not only the name of the first square that was retained; a triangular ground plan of the square, a city hall building, a fountain and baroque column with statues were eventually rebuilt in it to evoke the original square of old Most [cf. Spurný, 2016, 162–163]. The empty area in the city centre, before it became the square and the site of the *Central Most* shopping centre, was named *Plecháč*, roughly meaning ‘Place of Sheet Metal.’ During the communist era, this area was used for demonstrations and meetings, because the city of Most did not have a square in the traditional sense. There are two versions explaining the origin of the place name *Plecháč*. First, that the square was named after a sheet metal barrier which separated the area from the buildings under construction. Second, that the area was used for parking (the Czech word *plech* ‘sheet metal’ is also used to refer to the bodywork of cars). The original name *Plecháč* is known only among the older and middle generations of Most’s inhabitants.

<sup>5</sup> On the Polish city of Opole after the Second World War see [Jarczak, 2007]; on Czech toponyms and the city of Most in a more detailed way see [David, 2016a].

<sup>6</sup> In the latter two cases, the forms have never been standardized until the beginning of the 1990s.

A unique example of a place name unconsciously saving the memory of the old city is illustrated by the place name *U Jeptišek* ‘At the Nuns’ House.’ The street name originally referred to St Madeleine’s Monastery (later the Piarist Monastery) in the old Most. However, it now appears as the name of a pub in the centre of the new city. This pub is famous for its modern “monastic-style” decorations. Originally named *Start*, it was built in the 1960s. My research interviews revealed that the name *U Jeptišek* was originally used because only female serving staff were employed there. Later the nickname became the official name of the pub.

Street names also play a crucial role in the retention and re-creation of place-name memory in case of those villages destroyed by open-cast coal mining. Several streets in Most were named after such villages, e.g. *Albrechtická* (the village of Albrechtice), *Dřínovská* (Dřínov), *Komořanská* (Komořany), *Skyřická* (Skyřice), and *Třebušická* (Třebušice), even though they are situated on the periphery of the city.<sup>7</sup>

3. Transfer of chrematonyms. The names of pubs, cafes, buildings, etc. served as a useful linguistic tool in the creation of the new city of Most. One example of this process is the transfer of the name of the cultural centre *Reprezentační dům* ‘Representative House,’ known under the clipped form *Repre*, which was used as the official name for the newly built cultural centre. Other examples include the names *Opera*, originally a famous café and now an ordinary café in the city centre, the pub names *U Jelena* ‘The Deer Pub,’ *Slávie* ‘The Slavia Restaurant,’ and *Zlatá trojka* ‘Golden Three,’ one of the first coal mines in the vicinity of the old city centre, which is now the name of an art gallery in the new city library.

The last example is, perhaps, the most interesting. To explain the circumstances of its origin we have to look back into history. One of the most famous companies in inter-war Czechoslovakia was the Baťa shoemaking corporation. In most Czech cities, the company had modern American-style stores, and the name *Baťa* became a synonym for shoe stores in general. The connection between the making and selling of shoes and the Baťa company was so strong that after 1945, when the company was nationalized and renamed *Svit*, expressions like *Baťa* and *U Bati* ‘At Baťa’s’ still remained in use. The name was given not only to the stores previously belonging to the Baťa company, but to any newly built shoe store. My research in the Czech cities built during the communist era has indicated the same tendency in Poruba (a district of Ostrava) as in Most. This is illustrated by the unofficial name for the *Dům obuvi* ‘House of Shoes,’ built in Most during the 1980s, which was named (and is still called by older people) *Baťa* or *U Bati*. The use of this name was inspired not only by the Baťa phenomenon, but also by the existence of a Baťa store in the old Most.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the similar situation in Czech standardized urbanonymy, where names of local personalities appear predominantly in street names on the city periphery, see [David & Davidová Glogarová, 2015, 350–352].

From my previous research in the modern Czech cities of Ostrava and Havířov, the Polish city of Nowa Huta (Kraków) and the Slovak town of Nová Dubnica, the urban architecture and the layout of streets and squares appear to be the most important factors influencing city orientation and the inspiration for non-standardized place names [David, 2013, 54–55; David & Mácha, 2014, 88–96]. Cities built during the communist era typically featured a mixture of names from the communist pantheon and the famous personalities from the 19<sup>th</sup> century who were regarded as “progressive” [cf. David, 2011b, 177–178, 182–183]. The same characteristics can be seen in Most’s official street name system. However, this system was introduced gradually, and it lagged behind the pace of ongoing construction work. When apartment blocks were built, initially only their numbers were used for orientation and identification. The numerical system is still used today, although nowadays only the older generation are able to orient themselves precisely by the number of a particular block. Across all generations, local people used numerical expressions derived from the numbering of particular districts, such as *Stovky*, *Dvojstovky*, *Sedmistovky*, etc. ‘Hundred’, ‘Two Hundred’, ‘Seven Hundred’ — cf. the modern Czech cities of Havířov and Ostrava-Poruba [see David & Mácha, 2014, 92, 112]. This numerical system also applied to schools, although nowadays they are officially named after street names or after their specialization, and this type of identification is predominant in everyday communication. However, numerical names are still applied, e.g., *6. základní škola* ‘6<sup>th</sup> primary school’. The same as in the new cities explored in my previous research, an orientational role is also played by markets, offices, shops and restaurants, and entities typical of an urban area. Examples of place names include *U Rybárny* ‘At the Fishmonger’s,’ *U Báňskéjch* ‘Next to the Báňské stavby Company,’ *U Čedoku* ‘Next to the Čedok Company Office,’ *U Kubička* ‘Next to Kubiček’s Pub,’ *Mličňák* ‘Milk Bar,’ *U Krymu* ‘Next to the Krym (Crimea) Shopping Centre,’ *U Tří sýrů* ‘At the Three Cheeses’. Most, like many Czech cities, has long residential buildings in the shape of a hockey stick, named *Hokejka*.

A characteristic of the new Most is its many modern sculptures in public places. This is a typical feature of modern cities built during the communist era, in which sculptures and artifacts were used to humanize the sterile prefabricated space. In Most, this tradition continues to develop via a series of sculpture symposia. Some of the sculptures are named with irony and humor, e.g., *Mrzák* ‘The Cripple’ (officially *Fotbalista* ‘Football player’), *Teplí bratři* ‘The Gay Brothers’ (*Interkosmos* ‘Interkosmos Space Program’), or *Naháč* ‘The Naked Man’ (*Balance* ‘Balance’). They are used to denote places via place names such as *U Mrzáka* or *U Naháče* ‘Next to the Cripple’ or ‘Next to the Naked Man’. A striking example illustrating the influence of place names on the image of space is a new sculpture named *Ementál* ‘The Emmentaler Cheese.’ This was created specially for the place that is unofficially named *U Tří sýrů* ‘At the Three Cheeses,’ (see above) during the first sculpture symposium in 2008.



## 5. Conclusion

One of the main reasons for mapping non-standardized urban toponymy is the importance of preserving this material — not only for onomastic research, but also for research focusing on local identity and the perception of spaces through their place names. Another reason for doing so — and the one which is of particular relevance here — is the desire to collect and preserve toponymy as a part of the local cultural heritage. In case of the city of Most, this applies both to the old city, which has disappeared from the face of the earth, and also to the new city, whose short history has only received academic attention during the last twenty years. Faded photographs and personal memories connected with place names represent the only traces of this history. Collecting place names not only from the old Most, but also from the new Most has one more important function: we can best describe this by borrowing and applying the archaeological term “preservation research.” Until the present research on toponymy, the place names of Most have not been examined. Because the city of Most is situated in the former Sudetenland region, which had a predominantly German pre-war population, it did not form a part of the collection of Czech place names compiled between 1963 and 1980. The great challenge now is to continue in this line of research — focusing not only on the toponymy of the city of Most, but on that of all modern cities — in a genuinely interdisciplinary way.

- 
- Blanár, V. (2009). *Vlastné meno vo svetle teoretickej onomastiky* [Proper Names in the Light of Theoretical Onomastics]. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Brycz, P. (1998). *Jsem město* [I am the City]. Most: Hněvín.
- Brycz, P. (2008). *Mé ztracené město* [My Lost City]. Jihlava: Listen.
- David, J. (2011a). Commemorative Place Names — Their Specificity and Problems. *Names*, 59, 214–228. <https://doi.org/10.1179/002777311X13082331190074>
- David, J. (2011b). *Smršov, Brežněves a Rychlonožkova ulice. Kapitoly z moderní české toponymie* [Smršov, Brežněves and Rychlonožkova Street. Chapters on Modern Czech Toponymy]. Praha: Academia.
- David, J. (2012a). Czech Street Names: The Tendencies of Development in Modern Times. In D. Kremer, & D. Kremer (Eds.), *Die Stadt und ihre Namen* (pp. 227–238). Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- David, J. (2012b). ‘Living’ Toponymy in Czech New Towns (the Towns of Havířov and Ostrava-Poruba, Czech Republic). *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, 47, 459–468.
- David, J. (2013). Street Names — Between Ideology and Cultural Heritage. *Acta onomastica*, 54, 53–60.
- David, J. (2016a). Přesouvání paměti místa prostřednictvím toponymie — na příkladu města Most [Transfers of Place Memories via Toponymy — the Case of the City of Most]. In J. David (Ed.), *Toponyma. Kulturní dědictví a paměť míst* [Toponymy. Cultural Heritage and Place Memory] (pp. 78–86). Ostrava: Filozofická fakulta Ostravské univerzity.
- David, J. (2016b). Toponymie městského prostoru v kontextu mezioborovosti české onomastiky — kritické poznámky a perspektiva dalšího výzkumu [Toponymy of the Urban Area in the Context of Interdisciplinary Approaches to Czech Onomastic Research — Critical Remarks and Perspectives of Further Research]. *Studie z aplikované lingvistiky*, 7, 39–54.

- David, J., & Davidová Glogarová, J. (2015). Druhý život spisovatelů v toponymii moravskoslezského regionu — na příkladu urbanonymie Ostravy [Second Life of Writers in Toponymy of Moravian-Silesian Region — Illustrated with Street Names of the City of Ostrava]. In K. Czajkowski, J. Malura, & J. Spyra (Eds.), *Historik a literát v provincii — Historyk i pisarz na prowincji* [Historian and Writer in Province] (pp. 341–454). Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita.
- David, J., & Davidová Glogarová, J. (2016). Most — bourání města jako obraz stavu společnosti v zrcadle analýzy publicistiky Rudého práva [Most — The Demolition of a Town as a Reflection of the Social Situation, as Reflected in Opinion Pieces in Rudé Právo Newspaper]. In J. Malura, & M. Tomášek (Eds.), *Příroda vs. industriál. Vytváření prostoru v literatuře a výtvarném umění* [Natural vs. Industrial. Creating Space in Literature and Art] (pp. 205–224). Ostrava: Filozofická fakulta Ostravské univerzity.
- David, J., & Mácha, P. (2014). *Názvy míst. Paměť, identita, kulturní dědictví* [Place Names. Memory, Identity, Cultural Heritage]. Brno: Host.
- David, J., & Místecký, M. (2016). Toponymie moderního sídliště — na příkladu pátého stavebního obvodu městské části Ostrava-Poruba [A Toponymy of a Modern Housing Estate: A Case Study of the Fifth District of the Municipal Borough of Ostrava-Poruba]. *Acta onomastica*, 57, 26–37.
- Gade, D. W. (2003). Language, Identity, and the Scriptorial Landscape in Québec and Catalonia. *Geographical Review*, 93, 429–448.
- Glassheim, E. (2006). Ethnic Cleansing, Communism, and Environmental Devastation in Czechoslovakia's Borderlands, 1945–1989. *Journal of Modern History*, 78(1), 65–92. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499795>
- Glassheim, E. (2007). Most, the Town that Moved: Coal, Communists and the 'Gypsy Question' in Postwar Czechoslovakia. *Environment and History*, 13, 447–476.
- Hájek, P. (2008). *Jde pevně kupředu naše zem. Krajina českých zemí v období socialismu 1948–1989* [Our Country Moves Strongly Forward. The Landscape of the Czech Lands in the Period of Socialism 1948–1989]. Praha: Malá Skála.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (2009). *Kolektivní paměť* [Collective Memory]. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Hellmich, M. et al. (2014). Historický vývoj města Mostu [Historical Development of the City of Most]. In R. Šimůnek (Ed.), *Historický atlas měst České republiky* [The Historical Atlas of the Towns and Cities of the Czech Republic] (Vol. 26, pp. 1–38). Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Jarczak, Ł. (2007). O powojennych zmianach nazw ulic w Opolu [Postwar Changes of the Street Names in Opole]. In S. Gajda (Ed.), *Region w świetle nazw miejscowych* [A Region in the Light of Toponymy] (pp. 113–129). Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Kojetinová, M. (2016). O urbanonymických systémech pražských sídlišť a o obecných otázkách orientace v sídlištních prostorech [Urbanonymic Systems in Prague Housing Estates and Some General Questions of Orientation in Housing Estates Spaces]. *Acta onomastica*, 55, 167–180.
- Kojetinová, M. (2017). Marta, Jakešův prst, Husákovo ticho [Marta, Jakešův prst ('Jakeš's finger'), Husákovo ticho ('Husák's silence')] Place Names]. In L. Křížová, & J. Martínek (Eds.), *Od Karlova mostu ke Gottwaldovu* [From Charles Bridge to the City of Gottwaldov] (pp. 121–128). Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Krško, J. (1998). Mikrosociálne mikrotoponymy [Microsocial Microtoponyms]. In M. Majtán, & P. Žigo (Eds.), *13. slovenská onomastická konferencia* [13<sup>th</sup> Slovene Conference in Onomastics] (pp. 115–119). Bratislava: SAV.
- Krško, J. (2013). Toponymický priestor ako súčasť kultúrno-antropologického priestoru [Toponymic Space as Part of the Cultural-Anthropological Space]. *Acta onomastica*, 54, 151–169.
- Kuča, K. (2000). *Města a městečka v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku* [Cities and Towns in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia] (Vol. 4). Praha: Libri.
- Lábus, V. (2014). Poznámky k tzv. mikrostrukturním vztahům v onymii [Comments on So-Called Microstructural Relations in Onymy]. In E. Minářová, D. Sochorová, & J. Zítková (Eds.), *Vlastní jména v textech a kontextech* [Proper Names in Texts and Contexts] (pp. 47–52). Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

- Mapová sbírka Most* [Map Collection Most]. State Archive of the District of Most, Most.
- Matlovič, R. (2004). Tranzitívna podoba mesta a jeho intraurbánnych štruktúr v ére postkomunistickej transformácie a globalizácie [The Transitive Image of the Town and its Intra-Urban Structures in the Era of Postcommunist Transformation and Globalization]. *Sociológia*, 36, 137–148.
- Novák, V. (2012). *Most: nedokončené město* [Most: An Unfinished City]. Most: Hněvín.
- Páral, V. (1975). *Radost až do rána* [Happiness until Morning]. Praha: Melantrich.
- Petržilka, R. (2014). *Dějiny města Mostu v datech* [History of the City of Most in Dates]. Most: Hněvín.
- Pires, M. (2007). Investigating Non-Universal Popular Urban Toponyms: Birmingham's Pigeon Park. *Onoma*, 42, 131–154.
- Profous, A. (1951). *Místní jména v Čechách* [Names of Settled Places in Bohemia] (Vol. 3). Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění.
- Prošek, M. (2005). O jednom typu univerbizovaných pojmenování míst na -ák [To a Particular Type of Univerbised Place Names with a Suffix -ák]. *Naše řeč*, 88, 57–66.
- Pýcha, Č. (2014). Duchcovský viadukt. Socialistická politika paměti na regionální úrovni [Duchcov Viaduct: Socialist Memory Policy on a Regional Level]. In R. Šustrová, & L. Hédlová (Eds.), *Česká paměť. Národ, dějiny a místa paměti* (pp. 255–278). Praha: Academia.
- Šimůnek, R. (Ed.). (2014). *Historický atlas měst České republiky* [The Historical Atlas of the Towns and Cities of the Czech Republic] (Vol. 26). Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Spurný, M. (2014). Ustup, černé město, městu zelenému: Ospravedlnění likvidace starého Mostu mezi komunistickou utopií a moderní technokracií [Black City, Make Way for the Green City: Justifying the Liquidation of Old Most between Communist Utopia and Modern Technocracy]. *Dějiny a současnost*, 36(3), 22–25.
- Spurný, M. (2015). Most do budoucnosti. Příběh města na severu Čech jako studie proměn socialistické modernity [Old Most, New Most: The Story of a Town in North Bohemia as a Case Study of the Transformations of Socialist Modernity]. *Soudobé dějiny*, 22(1–2), 30–79.
- Spurný, M. (2016). *Most do budoucnosti. Laboratoř socialistické modernity na severu Čech* [Old Most, New Most: A Laboratory of Socialist Modernity in North Bohemia]. Praha: Karolinum.
- Usnesení vlády ČSSR č. 180/1964 [The Czechoslovakian Socialistic Republic Government Resolution № 180/1964]. State Archive of the District of Most, Most, the fund of Městský národní výbor Most; sign. 849.
- Zagajewski, A. (2007). *Dwa miasta* [Two Cities]. Warszawa: Zeszyty Literackie.
- Zagórski, Z. (Ed.). (2008). *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów* [Geographical Names of the City of Poznań. Collection of Studies]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Zmizelé Sudety. Das Verschwundene Sudetenland* [Lost Sudetenland] (2007). Domažlice: Nakladatelství Českého lesa.

Received 28 September 2017

\*\*\*

#### David, Jaroslav

PhD, Associate Professor,  
Head of the Department Czech Language  
Faculty of Arts, University of Ostrava  
5, Reální Street, 701 03 Ostrava,  
Czech Republic  
E-mail: jaroslav.david@osu.cz

#### Давид, Ярослав

PhD, доцент,  
заведующий кафедрой чешского языка  
философский факультет,  
Остравский университет  
Reální 5, 701 03 Ostrava, Czech Republic  
E-mail: jaroslav.david@osu.cz

**Ярослав Давид**Остравский университет  
Острава, Чехия**ТОПОНИМИЯ ПЕРЕМЕЩЕННОГО ГОРОДА:  
ГОРОД МОСТ, ЧЕШСКАЯ РЕСПУБЛИКА**

Статья посвящена топонимии города Мост (Северная Богемия, Чешская республика) и ее эволюции на протяжении второй половины XX в. В историческом плане рассматриваемый случай уникален: по решению властей в 1964–1982 гг. исторический город Мост, известный с XI в., был разрушен, чтобы освободить место для угольных шахт. Одновременно с этим к 1987 г. к югу от местоположения исторического Моста был построен новый город с тем же названием. В статье рассматривается топонимия вновь построенного города, являющего собой типичный пример социалистического модерна, и в особенности — функционирование неофициальных (народных) топонимов, рассматриваемых в сопоставлении с официальными урбанонимами. При этом автор уделяет особое внимание феномену переноса топонимов и хрематонимов из старого города в новый, а также роли топонимии в формировании и поддержании местной идентичности и коллективной памяти. Автор показывает, что сохранению памяти о старом городе способствовали инициативы государственной и местной власти, а именно: сохранение названия старого города, перенос некоторых названий улиц, а также использование хрематонимов (в основном названий питейных заведений), характерных для разрушенного Моста. Анализ топонимии основан на изучении архивных данных (главным образом карт), полевых исследованиях автора, а также индивидуальных и групповых интервью с жителями города, проведенных в 2014–2015 гг.

**Ключевые слова:** чешский язык, город Мост, названия улиц, неофициальная урбанонимия, народная топонимия, трансонимизация, местная идентичность, коллективная память.

*Рукопись поступила в редакцию 28.09.2017*